Optimal Dynamic Routing for the Wireless Relay Channel

Mark Shifrin, Omer Gurewitz, Asaf Cohen
Ben Gurion University of the Negev

Daniel S. Menasché
Federal Univ. of Rio de Janeiro

Dennis Goeckel
Univ. of Massachusetts at Amherst

arXiv:1601.06859v1 [cs.IT] 26 Jan 2016

***Abstract*—Consider a communication network with a source, a relay and a destination. Each time interval, the source may *dynamically* choose between a few possible coding schemes, based on the channel state, traffic pattern and its own queue status. For example, the source may choose between a direct route to the destination and a relay-assisted scheme. Clearly, due to the difference in the performance achieved, as well as the resources each scheme uses, a sender might wish to choose the most appropriate one based on its status.**

In this work, we formulate the problem as a Semi-Markov Decision Process. This formulation allows us to find an optimal policy, expressed as a function of the number of packets in the source's queue and other parameters. In particular, we show a general solution which covers various configurations, including different packet size distributions and varying channels. Furthermore, for the case of exponential transmission times, we analytically prove the optimal policy has a threshold structure, that is, there is a unique value of a single parameter which determines which scheme (or route) is optimal. Results are also validated with simulations for several interesting models.

I. Introduction

The relay channel, comprised of a source, a destination and a friendly relay, is a fundamental building block of wireless networks, and hence its consideration has long been a central part of network information theory[1]. In more recent years, its utility in providing spatial diversity in practical wireless communication systems has led to renewed widespread interest in the relay channel, but now with practical constraints that facilitate implementation[2]. Hence, the relay channel is ubiquitous in both classical network models as well as contemporary ones like those corresponding to wireless sensor networks or Internet of Things, and thus it merits continued attention.

First introduced by Cover and El Gamal in [1], the relay channel drew the attention of both the information theory and the networking communities, with contributions on the classical problem ranging from coding strategies and capacity results to routing. Significant work has considered several important coding strategies, e.g., *decode and forward* [1], [3], [2], *amplify and forward* [4] or *compress and forward* [1], as well as network control policies for multiple relays under a *given coding strategy*. However, modern wireless networks are extremely dynamic, with channel parameters and traffic patterns changing frequently. Consequently, a key question is how can a sender in such a relay building block *dynamically decide* on the best coding strategy, given the channel and traffic parameters available to it, as well as its own status.

For example, consider a sender in a relay channel, required to decide whether to use a direct link to the receiver, incurring high packet loss yet a small delay, or use decode and forward at the relay, possibly having a lower packet loss but a larger delay. In this paper, we derive a framework for a Decision Maker (DM) wishing to maximize the system throughput by leveraging either the direct path or the relay, while taking into account as many system parameters as possible, in this case, delay, packet losses and its current queue status. In this example, the DM faces a fundamental tension between increased success probability provided by the relay and its incurred delay, and one would expect that this tension will be resolved with the queue status in mind, as a full queue causes new arrivals to be rejected, incurring potential throughput loss. Thus, our goal is to rigorously analyze this tension, and identify the optimal strategy.

The literature on the relay channel can be roughly categorized into two groups. The first considers the problem from an information theoretic perspective, aiming at a characterization of the channel capacity under various settings and constraints. Starting with the pioneering work of [1], which assumed that the relay is full duplex, several interesting scenarios were solved, e.g., the degraded case, several MIMO settings [5] or a class of erasure channels [6]. Cooperative strategies and their performance in relay networks were considered in [7]. Yet, the problem in its most general form is still open.

On the other hand, a large body of work is devoted to the scheduling perspective, assuming a relay (or several relays) which cannot receive and transmit simultaneously (half-duplex), and focusing on choosing the appropriate relays, optimal routing, etc. For example, Khojastepour *et al.* [3] considered two *modes* of operation in the context of 'cheap' relays. Selection relaying schemes were considered in [8] as a possible method to achieve cooperative diversity. Yeh and Berry [9] considered control policies which account for queue dynamics in order to optimize both scheduling and routing in relay networks. Recently, Urgaonkar and Neely [10] considered resource allocation in a relay network under stringent delay constraints. Finally, it is clear that the scheduling and control problems in relay networks, and wireless networks in general, are even more involved under practical constraints such as finite buffers [11], [12].

A key feature, and a source for complications in such relay channels, is that they encompass both space and time diversity. That is, space diversity can be achieved by transmitting



Fig. 1. Relay channel

simultaneously through two channels, minimizing the effects of fading in a single slot, while time diversity can be achieved since fading also varies over time, hence different schemes can be used at different times. However, previous work accounted either for time diversity and delay constraints, e.g., Berry and Gallager [13] and Collins and Cruz [14], or space diversity, e.g., Scaglione, Goeckel and Laneman [2] and references therein.

A. Main Contribution

In this work, we define and analyze a basic relay model, which captures the important concepts above, that is, space diversity, time diversity and finite buffers, yet is simple enough to allow rigorous analysis. Specifically, we consider two basic coding strategies, *direct transmission* and *relaying*, each of which having different parameters in terms of rate, packet loss probabilities, etc. Then, we focus on the *decision problem* at the source, which should select between these two strategies *dynamically* based on the channel and traffic parameters, as well as its queue status. We formulate this decision problem as a Semi-Markov Decision Process (SMDP) [15] in order to characterize the optimal policy and the resulting throughput. Such a characterization is the key to understanding which coding strategy is better and under which circumstances. When fully known, the strategy clearly marks the habitat of each coding strategy as a function of the channel, traffic pattern and buffer status.

We derive the equations for the value function of the SMDPs in several interesting scenarios. Moreover, when transmission times are exponentially distributed, we prove there exists an *optimal policy with a threshold structure*, that is, the source should make use of the relay if the number of pending packets is lower than a given threshold, and transmit directly otherwise. Besides completely characterizing the optimal policy analytically,such a result facilitates fast convergence rates of practical learning algorithms, as the optimal policy is known to be governed by a single scalar parameter.

While a preliminary paper [16] gave basic numerical results for a related model, tothe best of our knowledge, this work is the first to *analyze* a decision problem for the relay channel, accounting for both time and space diversity, a finite buffer at the source and general transmission times.

II. System model and metrics

The application level at the source (S) produces packets of (possibly) variable length to be transmitted to the destination (D). The source has limited packet storage in the form of a buffer of size B. Once the buffer is full, new packets produced by the application are instantly dropped and hence will not be transmitted. The source attempts to communicate the packet at the head of the buffer to the destination with the (potential) assistance of a relay node (R). In "direct" mode, the transmission from the source is processed by the destination with the relay playing no role. In "relay" mode, the source transmits for a time interval, and then the relay, based on the source transmission and, possibly in conjunction with the source, continues to transmit the same packet. The method of relaying might be a form of decode-and-forward (DF) or amplify-and-forward (AF), or one of the many improved versions of such; by exploiting the relay to achieve diversity, outage performance is improved over direct transmission [2]. Hence, the tension is clear: a direct path that uses less resources (time) but at a higher packet loss probability, or a relay path that exploits more resources to obtain a lower packet loss probability.

We assume that the three channels of interest (source to destination, source to relay, relay to destination), are each quasi-static fading channels, which means that they do not change over the transmission period of a single packet. Let $P_{s,d}$ be the transmission power when a direct transmission is employed, and $P_{s,r}$ and $P_{r,d}$ be the transmission power in the first and second time intervals, respectively, when the relay is employed. Let $\alpha_t^{s,d}, \alpha_t^{s,r}, \alpha_t^{r,d}$ be the magnitude of the fading at time t between the source and destination, source and relay, and relay and destination, respectively. Then, the instantaneous rate ω_t^d (resp. ω_t^r) supported by the channel can be easily found given the method of relaying (see [2]), and an outage occurs if, due to the randomness of the fading gains, the rate supported by the scheme falls below the rate r_t at which information bits are encoded into symbols. Hence, given $P_{r,d}$, $P_{s,d}$ and $P_{s,r}$, possibly knowledge of the (prior) channel state, and a characterization the channel dynamics, the distributions of the three fading variables $\alpha_t^{s,d}, \alpha_t^{s,r}, \alpha_t^{r,d}$ are known, and the packet loss probabilities p_d and p_r can be determined in a straightforward manner as:

$$p_d = P(\omega_t^d \leq r_t), \qquad p_r = P(\omega_t^r \leq r_t). \tag{1}$$

For the sequence of fading values observed across source packets, we assume a Markov process; that is, the distribution of the fading for future packets is independent of the past given the current state of the channel. These dynamics reflect well-known channel models (e.g. i.i.d. fading, Gilbert-Elliot model). Denote the channel state by h, and the channel transition probability from state y to state x by $p(x|y)$. Recalling that the distribution of the transmission time varies depending on whether the direct path or relay path is chosen, we assume these probabilities can be different depending on the transmission mode (relay or direct). Also, for the empty buffer state, we allow these probabilities to be distinct from those at other buffer states, hence capturing the time it takes until the first packet arrival to the queue.Clearly, $\sum_{h'} p^u(h'|h) = 1$, where the superscript u, $u \in \{r, d\}$ denotes the transmission mode (r: relay; d: direct). The DM obtains the packet losses for each such fading value. Next, assume that the packet arrival process at the source is a Poisson point process with intensity λ, and

recall that the source can store up to B packets in a buffer, regardless of the size of each packet. Let $n \in \{0, 1, \ldots, B\}$ be the number of packets currently in the a buffer. Denote the size of the packet at the head of the source's queue (in the case it can be sampled prior to the transmission and thus be part of the input to the decision algorithm) by k. The *packet size transition probabilities*, denoted by $q(x|y)$, can vary according to the action in the current transmission. And, as in the case of the channel transition probabilities, these probabilities can be different for the empty buffer state to allow for the possibility of a different size distribution for the first packet to arrive into the empty buffer.Note that $\sum_{k'} q^u(k'|k) = 1$ for each possible action u. Note that q^u can capture complex packet arrival patterns. For example, sequence of big packets which is likely to be followed by sequence of small patterns and vice versa can be modeled in the case the appropriate values for q^u are selected. We assume that the packet arrival process and channel fading process are independentof one another. With the coding rate r_t information bits per channel symbol fixed throughout this work, the variable packet length is worked into our model by mapping it to a variable transmission time, which, because of the extra time involved for relaying, depends on the path r or d selected [1]. Hence, in the case the packet size is known, it will determine the transmission time. Otherwise, the transmission time is given by a corresponding probability density function (pdf), denoted by $g^u(t)$. Clearly, this pdf can capture the distribution of the packet size; however, our general model makes no assumptions about $g^u(t)$, and hence it can return any positive values and capture other model aspects, if desired. We assume that no new transmission can be initiated before the previous transmission, either covering one or two intervals depending on the routing choice, is complete. For convenience, in the sequel, we will refer to this time as an atomic period. Given the model above, $g^d(t)$ and $g^r(t)$ can be readily calculated. The performance criterion is the expected total discounted infinite horizon reward which is given by the following well-known definition

$$J = \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-\gamma t} r(t) dt = \mathbb{E} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \int_{\sigma_m}^{\sigma_{m+1}} e^{-\gamma t} r_m dA(t)$$

where γ is a discount factor and $r(t)$ is a reward accumulated at time t. The equality is reasoned by the fact that in our model rewards are only awarded at discrete time points (e.g. transmission opportunities ends) denoted by σ_m, $m \in \{0, 1, \cdots\}$ that is, where the differential of counting process A, counting the transmission attempts and formally defined by

$$A(t) = \sup\{l \geq 0 : \sum_{i=0}^{l} \sigma_i < t\}$$

is positive. However, in general, the reward function $r(t)$ allows to capture continuous cost, e.g. energy cost which can be proportional to the buffer occupancy at time t. Note that r_m may be equivalent to a size of the successfully decoded packet transmitted in transmission opportunity m, or to a constant reward $r_m = C$, regardless of its size; it may incorporate additional cost factors predefined by DM. Without loss of generality, we assume that lost or dropped packets yield no reward. Thus, our goal is the following.

Problem Statement: Find the dynamic routing policy, which takes as input the current occupancy of the buffer and information (if any) on the current state of the channel and the packet size at the source's queue head, and provides as output a decision on whether to employ the direct or relay path, such that J is maximized.

We formulate the described problem by a Semi Markov Decision Process (SMDP), as formally defined in the next section.

III. SMDP-BASED FORMULATION AND SOLUTION

In this section, we define the general form of the SMDP and give specific examples. We present Bellman equations which see states right after accomplished transmissions. Hence, the state transitions happen after relay or direct transmission ends, then routing decision referring to the next transmission happens. At this point of time, we have to account for all possible transitions. This includes number of arrivals, channel transitions and leading packet size transitions. To this end, we specify the state structure. Denote the state space by $\mathbf{S}$. In the most general case the state $s \in \mathbf{S}$ is expressed by the triplet $(n, h, k) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ where n stands for the number of packets in the system, h stands for the medium (channels) state and k stands for the size of the packet which is to be transmitted in the upcoming transmission. Note that due to this structure, the state with maximal number of packets, i.e. $n = B$ are not defined. Hence, for simplicity, we will assume in this section that the buffer capacity is given by $B + 1$.

The probability for $j - i$ packets to arrive during transmission interval of length t is denoted by $\varrho(j|i, t)$ and is governed by a Poisson distribution with average mean λt. The action space is defined by $A = \{r, d\}$, standing for relay transmission and direct transmission. In the case the buffer was empty, the next decision will be performed right after next arrival. Otherwise, the actions are taken right after the accomplished transmissions. In order to simplify the analysis, we assume that the reward for the transmission is accumulated at the *beginning* of the transmission. As long as the time distribution of the upcoming transition is known, we weigh that reward by the corresponding average discount at the end of the transmission. As defined, our performance metric is discounted infinite horizon reward. This metric gives a discounted importance to the instantaneous reward which will be gained in future. The connection between this criterion and average infinite reward criterion is well understood. In particular, under mild conditions, they possess the similar optimal policy. Using

[1]Note that for a physical layer operating at capacity, (1) is valid regardless of the packet length.

variable	description	comment
$\mathbf{S}$	state space of SMDP	
$\mathbf{A}$	action space	
$\mathcal{U}$	policy space	
λ	arrival rate	
B	maximum number of packets in system (including the one being transmitted)	
$V(s)$	Value function at state s	$V(s)=\max\{V^{(r)}(s),V^{(d)}(s)\}$
$V^{(r)}(s)$	cost associated with decision r at state s	
$V^{(d)}(s)$	cost associated with decision d at state s	
$\beta_{r,s}$	discount associated with relay transmission	
$\beta_{d,s}$	discount associated with direct transmission	
C	number of frames per packet	expresses the reward
$\mu_{d,s}$	transmission rate of direct channel at state s	
$\mu_{r,s}$	transmission rate of relay channel at state s	
$\tau_{d,s}$	mean time to transmit a packet directly at state s	$\tau_{d,s}=1/\mu_{d,s}$
$\tau_{r,s}$	mean time to transmit a packet through relay at state s	$\tau_{r,s}=1/\mu_{r,s}$
p_r	packet loss probability in relay transmission	
p_d	packet loss probability in direct transmission	
γ	discount factor	
π	policy (subscript)	
$g^{\pi}(t)$	pdf of transmission time then using policy π	
$P^a(j\|i,t)$	probability of $j-i$ arrivals after t time units, having i packets at transmission start and acting a	$a\in\{r,d\}$
$p^a(h'\|h)$	channel transition probabilities after acting a	
$q^a(k'\|k)$	packet size transition probabilities after acting a	the packet is at the buffer's head

TABLE I
SMDP NOTATION.

dynamic programming,

$$J^{\pi}(s_0)=\mathbb{E}r^{\pi}(s_0)+\mathbb{E}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\int_{\sigma_m}^{\sigma_{m+1}}e^{-\gamma t}r_m dA=$$
$$\mathbb{E}r^{\pi}(s_0)+\mathbb{E}_{(\sigma_1,s_1)}[e^{-\gamma\sigma_1}V(s_1)]$$

Note that the second term of the above is given by $\mathbb{E}_{(\sigma_1,s_1)}[e^{-\gamma\sigma_1}V(s_1)]$. Specifically,

$$J^{\pi}(s_0)=\mathbb{E}r^{\pi}(s_0)+\Big[\sum_{s_1=(h',k',j)}V(s_1)\cdot$$
$$\int_0^{\infty}e^{-\gamma t}q^{\pi(s_0)}(k'|k)p^{\pi(s_0)}(h'|h)\varrho(j|i,t)g^{\pi(s_0)}(t)dt\Big]= \quad (2)$$
$$\mathbb{E}r^{\pi}(s_0)+\Big[\sum_{h'}p^{\pi(s_0)}(h'|h)\sum_{k'}q^{\pi(s_0)}(k'|k)\sum_{j}V(s_1)\cdot$$
$$\int_0^{\infty}e^{-\gamma t}\varrho(j|i,t)g^{\pi(s_0)}(t)dt\Big]. \quad (3)$$

$\mathbb{E}r^{\pi}(s_0)$ is the expected average reward at the initial state s_0. The first (i.e the outer) summation is over all possible next channel states. It is degenerated if the channel is fixed. The second summation is over all possible packet sizes to be transmitted at state s_1. If packet size is unknown, or all packet sizes are equal this sum degenerates. The third summation is over the number of arrivals to the queue during the first transmission. The integration accounts for the average time the first transmission interval takes. Hence, the transmission time pdf $g^{\pi(s_0)}$ may depend on the action taken in state s_0. Observe that each product of probabilities of the form $q^{\pi(s_0)}(k'|k)p^{\pi(s_0)}(h'|h)\varrho(j|i,t)$ is a weight of the corresponding value function at the next state s_1.The optimal value function is retrieved by the maximization over all admissible policies $V(s_0)=\max_{\pi}J^{\pi}(s_0)$ We bring next threeexamples, for which the corresponding Bellman equations can be and written in the tractable form and the value functions can be explicitly calculated, e.g. by value iteration [15].

1) Fixed channel with exponential transmission times: We treat a simple example of a fixed channel, with no packet size knowledge prior to transmission. Denote the exponentially distributed transmission times $\frac{1}{\mu_u}$, $u\in\{d,r\}$. Note that during a relay transmission, the time the first transmission interval took is assumed to be known, right before the 2nd interval is started, hence during the second interval it is deterministic. Therefore, one sees that the total relay transmission time is exponentially distributed. The state space is one-dimensional, so, for simplicity, we assume $s=n$, i.e., the number of packets at a source. Substituting exponential transmission time for $g^u(t)$ in (2), where superscript u stands for the action taken, we have

$$J^u(j)=C(1-p_u)E[e^{-\gamma\tau_u}]+$$
$$\sum_{i=j-1}^{B-1}V(i)(\int_0^{\infty}e^{-\gamma\tau_u}\frac{e^{-\lambda\tau_u}(\lambda\tau_u)^{i-j+1}}{(i-j+1)!}\mu_u e^{-\mu_u\tau_u}d\tau_u)+$$
$$+V(B)\int_0^{\infty}e^{-\gamma\tau_u}\varrho(B|j,t)\mu_u e^{-\mu_u\tau_u}d\tau_u,$$

where $\varrho(B|j,t)=\Big(1-\sum_{i=j-1}^{B-1}\frac{e^{-\lambda\tau_u}(\lambda\tau_u)^{i-j+1}}{(i-j+1)!}\Big)$, that is, the probability that by the transmission end the buffer is full is given by subtraction from 1 of the sum of all probabilities which account for the cases when the number of arrivals

did not fill the buffer to the maximum capacity. Note that $\int_0^\infty t^n e^{-st} dt = \frac{n!}{s^{n+1}}$. Thus, for $0 < j < B$ we have,

$$J^u(j) = C(1-p_u)\frac{\mu_u}{\mu_u+\gamma} + \sum_{i=j-1}^{B-1} V(i)\frac{\lambda^{i-j+1}\mu_u}{(\gamma+\mu_u+\lambda)^{i-j+2}} + V(B)\left(\frac{\mu_u}{\gamma+\mu_u} - \sum_{i=j-1}^{B-1}\frac{\lambda^{i-j+1}\mu_u}{(\gamma+\mu_u+\lambda)^{i-j+2}}\right)$$

and the boundary conditions

$$V(0) = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda+\gamma}V(1)$$

$$J^u(B) = C(1-p_u)\frac{\mu_a}{\mu_a+\gamma} + C(1-p_a)\frac{\mu_a}{\mu_a+\gamma} + \frac{\mu_a}{\mu_a+\gamma}V(B) - \frac{\mu_a}{\mu_a+\gamma+\lambda}V(B)$$

The optimal value function is given by $V(n) = \max_a J^a(n)$.

2) Channel with deterministic transmission times and known packet size: Consider a source which samples the packet size before the transmission. Consider two possible sizes, denoted by k_1 and k_2. Namely, $s = \{n, k\}$, $n \in \{0, \cdots, B\}$ and $k \in \{k_1, k_2\}$. We assume that packet size dynamics is given by a discrete Markov Chain. Denote transmission time of packet of size k as $\tau_{u,k}$. The packet loss probabilities are $p_{r,k}$ and $p_{d,k}$, for the size k of a packet to be transmitted. The instantaneous rewards are $C(1-p_{r,k})$ and $C(1-p_{d,k})$, correspondingly, which are further weighted by the accumulated delay $\beta_{u,k}$ at the end of the transmission which is about to start. We have

$$J^u(i,k) = C(1-p_{a,k})\beta_{u,k} + \sum_{k'}\sum_{j=i-1}^{B} V(j,k)\int_0^\infty e^{-\gamma t}\varrho(j|i,t)q^u(k'|k)\delta(t-\tau_{u,k})dt = C(1-p_{u,k})e^{-\gamma\tau_{u,k}} + \sum_{k'}\sum_{j=i-1}^{B} e^{-\gamma\tau_u}\varrho(j|i,\tau_{u,k})q^u(k'|k)V(j,k'),$$

where k is the packet size at the head of the queue and Poisson distribution for ϱ is substituted. Hence, the value functions are $V(i,k_1) = \max_u\{J^u(i,k_1)\}$, $V(i,k_2) = \max_u\{J^u(i,k_2)\}$ The boundary condition, then the buffer is empty

$$V(0,k) = \mathbb{E}e^{-\gamma t_\lambda}V(1,k) = \sum_{k'}\frac{\lambda}{\gamma+\lambda}\big(q_0(k'|k,0)V(1,k)\big)$$

3) Gilbert-Elliot channel with uniform transmission times: Assume the packet sizes cannot be sampled, but are known to have a uniform distribution over all channels. Consider two states of the *entire medium*, denoted by A and B. Namely, both relay and direct routes are fully dependent and can simultaneously be in one of the states.That is, the channel state refers to the entire medium. The channel state is sampled prior to each upcoming transmission, and is modeled as part of the state space, which determines the packet losses in current transmission slot. Namely, $s = \{n, h\}$, $n \in \{0, \cdots, B\}$ and $h \in \{A, B\}$. We assume that channel dynamics can be expressed by discrete Markov Chain, which corresponds to the Gilbert–Elliott (GE) channel. The packet transmission time $\tau_{r,h}$ (resp. $\tau_{d,h}$) over relay (resp. direct) channel is uniformly distributed. The uniform distributions intervals depend on both the channel state and the action and are given by $[u_{u,h}, d_{u,h}]$. Note, that the total relay transmission time is multiplied by η, $\eta > 1$. That is, the second slot (i.e. the transmission from relay to the destination) takes deterministic time which is equal to $(\eta-1)\tau_{r,h}$. We assume that the corresponding intervals $[d_{r,h}, u_{r,h}]$ account for this multiplication. We assume that channel transition probabilities, denoted by $q_u(h'|h)$, depend on the action u.

$$J^u(i,h) = C(1-p_{u,h})\beta_{u,h} + \sum_j\sum_{h'} V(j,h')\int_0^\infty e^{-\gamma t}\varrho(j|i,t)q^u(h'|h)g^{u,h}(t)dt = C(1-p_{u,h})\beta_{u,h} + \frac{1}{u_{u,h}-d_{u,h}}\sum_{j=i-1}^{B}\sum_{h'} V(j,h')\int_{d_{u,h}}^{u_{u,h}} e^{-\gamma t}\varrho(j|i,t)q^u(h'|h)dt$$

To solve the integration, Poisson distributions are substituted, and well known integration $\int x^n e^{cx}\ \mathrm{d}x = e^{cx}\sum_{i=0}^{n}(-1)^{n-i}\frac{n!}{i!\,c^{n-i+1}}x^i$ is applied. $\beta_{u,s}$ is the discount which is given by $\int_{d_{u,h}}^{u_{u,h}} e^{-\gamma t}\frac{1}{u_{u,h}-d_{u,h}}dt = \frac{e^{-\gamma(d_{u,h}-u_{u,h})}}{u_{u,h}-d_{u,h}}$. Note that the probability to have full buffer after end of transmission is given by $\varrho(B|i,t) = (1-\sum_{i=j-1}^{B-1}\varrho(j|i,t))$. Finally, the value function for state s is given $V(s) = max_u\{J^u(s)\}$. Note that for all examples the boundary conditions at buffer limits are separately written.

IV. Structure of optimal policies

The structure of optimal dynamic routing policies has particular importance, for several reasons. First, in order to assess the resources needed for the policy implementation at wireless nodes. Next, structural properties can be exploited by learning algorithms in order to significantly reduce the complexity of optimal policy search. This is especially useful for the system with large state-space. For example, once the policy is proven to possess a *threshold* structure in one of the dimensions of a state space, the data to hold the policy consists of only single scalar. Moreover, the configuration of similar systems can be analytically or heuristically based on the existing one, e.g. by means of reinforcement learning aimed to policy improvement. We now refer to example presented in III-1. Observe that Bellman equations written by SMDP have a form where value function at each state depends on all other states. This particular property makes the analyses of the value function intractable. Hence, we use an MDP formulation which is equivalent to the SMDP formulation presented above, for the exponential case.

A. MDP formulation for the exponential case

We now formally define the states and the corresponding value functions. The definition of the state space that follows

is inspired by SMDP admission control example presented in [15, chpt. 11]. Recall that $n \in \{0, \cdots, B\}$ stands for the number of packet in the buffer.

- state (n), right after the departure (ended transmission) which leaves n packet at the source. V_n.
- state (d, n), right after the arrival to the system which previously had n packet, including the one which is currently being *directly* transmitted. $V_n^{(d,a)}$.
- state (r, n), right after the arrival to the system which previously had n packet, including the one which is currently being transmitted *via relay*. $V_n^{(r,a)}$.

We are mainly interested in the values of states denoted by (n), i.e. $V(n)$, both because the decisions are made only in these states and because they are comparable with the SMDP values. Note that in the arrival states (n, d) and (n, r) do not include the packet which just has arrived. Clearly it will be admitted right after the arrival in the case the buffer is not full. Denote $\delta_r = (\mu_r + \lambda + \gamma)^{-1}$,$\delta_d = (\mu_d + \lambda + \gamma)^{-1}$, $\beta_d = (\mu_d + \gamma)^{-1}$,$\beta_r = (\mu_r + \gamma)^{-1}$and $\bar{\delta} = (\gamma + \lambda)^{-1}$. Recall that the reward is obtained once the transmission is finished, however it is awarded at the start of the transmission, multiplied by the expected discount. Write Bellman equations for the value function for states at arrival events. These equations also define the corresponding operators $\mathbb{A}_d$ and $\mathbb{A}_r$, which act in the space of function from $\{0, \cdots, B\}$ to $\mathbb{R}$.

$$\begin{aligned} V_n^{(d,a)} &= \mu_d \delta_d V_n + \lambda \delta_d V_{n+1}^{(d,a)} = \mathbb{A}_d V_n^{(d,a)} \\ V_n^{(r,a)} &= \mu_r \delta_r V_n + \lambda \delta_r V_{n+1}^{(r,a)} = \mathbb{A}_r V_n^{(r,a)} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Note that the decisions are only made after departures. However, we write value functions and the corresponding operators for both decision types. The maximization is performed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} V_n &= \max(V_n^{(d,d)}, V_n^{(r,d)}) \\ &= \max((\mathbb{T}_d V_n, \mathbb{T}_r V_n) = \mathbb{T} V_n, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{T}_r, \mathbb{T}_d$ act in the space of function from $\{0, \cdots, B\}$ to $\mathbb{R}$. In particular, $\mathbb{T}_r$ and $\mathbb{T}_d$ defined by the following Bellman equations

$$\begin{aligned} V_n^{(d,d)} &= \mu_d \delta_d V_{n-1} + \lambda \delta_d V_n^{(d,a)} + (1 - p_d) C \beta_d = \mathbb{T}_d V_n \\ V_n^{(r,d)} &= \mu_r \delta_r V_{n-1} + \lambda \delta_r V_n^{(r,a)} + (1 - p_r) C \beta_r = \mathbb{T}_r V_n \end{aligned}$$

The derivation of the equations above are presented in appendix B. The boundary conditions at buffer limit B are

$$\begin{aligned} V_B^{(d,a)} &= \mu_d \delta_d V_{B-1} + \lambda \delta_d V_B^{(d,a)} \\ V_B^{(r,a)} &= \mu_r \delta_r V_{B-1} + \lambda \delta_r V_B^{(r,a)}, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

and at empty buffer are

$$V_0^{d,d} = \lambda \bar{\delta} V_0^{(d,a)}, \quad V_0^{r,d} = \lambda \bar{\delta} V_0^{(r,a)} \tag{6}$$

Proposition 1. *The relay problem with exponentially distributed transmission times modeled by MDP is solved by the optimal policy of a threshold type. Namely, there exists a unique threshold b, $0 \leq b \leq B$, such that the optimal policy is to transmit via relay path for all states where $n \leq b$ and to transmit directly otherwise.*

By the equivalence of the value functions at departures in MDP and SMDP formulations trivially the following holds.

Corollary 1. *The relay problem modeled in section III by SMDP is solved by the optimal policy of threshold type.*

We will use the following definition.

Definition 1 (Inter-concavity)**.** *U_n is inter-concave with respect to Y_n if*

$$U_n - U_{n-1} \geq Y_{n+1} - Y_n \text{ interconcavity}$$

We say that U_n is *concave* if it is inter-concave with respect to itself.

To this end, let $\mathcal{S}$ be a set where each of its elements is a five-tuple of B-dimensional vectors denoted by $\{U, U^{d,a}, U^{r,a}, U^{r,d}, U^{d,d}\}$ satisfying the following properties

1) $\{U, U^{d,a}, U^{r,a}\}$ are concave in $n \in \{1, \cdots, B\}$,
2) $\{U, U^{d,a}, U^{r,a}\}$ are non-decreasing in $n \in \{0, \cdots, B\}$,
3) $U^{r,a}$ is inter-concave with respect to $U^{d,a}$, and $U^{r,d}$ is inter-concave with respect to $U^{d,d}$.
4) the difference $U_n^{r,d} - U_n^{d,d}$ is increasing in n, $n \in \{0, \cdots, B\}$, and
5) $\{U, U^{d,a}, U^{r,a}\}$ have their slope bounded by some positive constant K, that is, $U_n - U_{n-1} < K$, $U_n^{r,s} - U_{n-1}^{r,a} < K$ and $U_n^{d,a} - U_{n-1}^{d,a} < K$

For the proof of the proposition we will need the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *The operators $\mathbb{A}_d$,$\mathbb{A}_r$,$\mathbb{T}$ preserve properties 1)-5).*

See appendix A for the proof of the lemma.

Proof of proposition 1: The proof is based on a well known result that operators associated with Bellman equation are contracting [15] , that is, using the maximum metric $\| U \| = \max_x |U(x)|$ it holds $a \| U - W \| < \| \mathbb{T}U - \mathbb{T}W \|$ for some $0 < a < 1$. Hence, the operators defined above are contraction mappings., equipped with the metric $\rho(U; W) = ||U - W||$ is a complete metric space. Since $\mathcal{S}$ is a complete metric space and the operators are strict contractions, they have corresponding fixed points (e.g. in [17, Theorem V.18]). Now since $\mathcal{S}$ is not empty (one can easily construct such functions; the technical details are omitted), the functions which are in $\mathcal{S}$ and have the operators $\mathbb{A}_r, \mathbb{A}_d, \mathbb{T}$ applied on them, by lemma 1 stay in $\mathcal{S}$. By contraction, the repetitious application brings the result infinitesimally close to the fixed points of $\mathbb{A}_r, \mathbb{A}_d, \mathbb{T}$. Recall that the value functions $V_n, V_n^{(d,a)}, V_n^{(r,a)}$ are the unique solution of *all* functions, including those that in $\mathcal{S}$, acting from $n \in \{0, \cdots, B\}$ to $\mathbb{R}$, to the *same* equations; (trivially, the mild conditions for uniqueness and existence, see e.g. [15, Chapter 6.2], apply). As a result, $\{V, V^{(d,a)}, V^{(r,a)}, V^{(d,d)}, V^{(r,d)}\}$ coincide with these fixed points and they in $\mathcal{S}$. In particular, $V^{(d,d)}$ and $V^{(r,d)}$ possess property 4), which is equivalent of having at most one policy switch state. This proves the proposition. ■

variable	description	comment
c_r	instantaneous relay reward	weighted by the expected discount at the end of transmission
c_d	instantaneous direct reward	weighted by the expected discount at the end of transmission
(n,r)	state right after arrival the active transmission is by relay	$n \in \{1,\dots,B\}$
(n,d)	state right after arrival the active transmission is direct	$n \in \{1,\dots,B\}$
$(0,r)$	state right after arrival to the empty source, will be transmitted by relay	
$(0,d)$	state right after arrival to the empty source, will be directly transmitted	
(n)	state right after transmission end, n packets still present in the buffer	$n \in \{0,1,\dots,B-1\}$ is prior to new decision
$V_n^{(r,d)}$	value function associated with action r	$n \in \{0,\dots,B-1\}$
$V_n^{(d,d)}$	value function associated with action d	$n \in \{0,\dots,B-1\}$
V_n	value function at state (n)	$V_n = \max(V_n^{(r,d)}, V_n^{(d,d)})$
$V_n^{(r,a)}$	value function at state $(n,(r,a))$	$n \in \{0,\dots,B\}$
$V_n^{(d,a)}$	value function at state $(n,(d,a))$	$n \in \{0,\dots,B\}$
$\mathbb{A}_r$	operator applied after arrival the active transmission is relay	acts on $V_n^{(r,a)}$
$\mathbb{A}_d$	operator applied after arrival the active transmission is direct	acts on $V_n^{(d,a)}$
$\mathbb{T}_d$	operator applied after departure, decides next direct transmission	acts on V_n
$\mathbb{T}_r$	operator applied after departure, decides next relay transmission	acts on V_n
$\mathbb{T}$	maximizer - the optimal decision for the next transmission	$\mathbb{T}V_n = \max\{\mathbb{T}_r V_n, \mathbb{T}_d V_n\}$

TABLE II
MDP NOTATION.

Numerical results: Examples of threshold policies with exponential, deterministic and uniform transmission times with fixed channels (resp. Gilbert-Elliot channels) are presented in figure 2, (resp figure 3). See that threshold structure is



Fig. 2. Value functions (V) at different buffer states (Q). Average transmission rates are given by $\mu_r = 9$ and $\mu_d = 12$. For uniform $u_u = 0.2\frac{1}{\mu_u}, d_u = 1.8\frac{1}{\mu_u}$. The two graphs are at high load ($\lambda = 13$), low load ($\lambda = 9$). Packet loss were $p_r = 0.25, p_d = 0.42$

observed in all simulated distributions., even though the proof only covers the exponential case. See that in the Gilbert-Elliot channels there is a separate threshold for each channel type.



Fig. 3. Value functions (V) at different buffer states (Q). Average transmission rates are given by $\mu_r = 10$ and $\mu_d = 15$. For uniform $u_{u,h} = 0.15\frac{1}{\mu_u}, d_{u,h} = 1.85\frac{1}{\mu_u}$. The two graphs are at high load ($\lambda = 15$), low load ($\lambda = 10$). Packet loss were $p_{r,A} = 0.2, p_{d,A} = 0.3$, $p_{r,B} = 0.35, p_{d,B} = 0.4$.

REFERENCES

[1] T. M. Cover and A. E. Gamal, "Capacity theorems for the relay channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, pp. 572–584, 1979.

[2] A. Scaglione, D. L. Goeckel, and J. N. Laneman, "Cooperative communications in mobile ad hoc networks," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 23 (5), pp. 18–29, 2006.

[3] M. A. Khojastepour, A. Sabharwal, and B. Aazhang, "The capacity of 'cheap' relay networks," in *CISS*, 2003. [Online]. Available: http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu/586862.html

[4] J. N. Laneman and G. W. Wornell, "Distributed space-time-coded protocols for exploiting cooperative diversity in wireless networks," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 49, no. 10, pp. 2415–2425, 2003.

[5] B. Wang, J. Zhang, and A. Host-Madsen, "On the capacity of mimo relay channels," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 29–43, 2005.

[6] R. Khalili and K. Salamatian, "On the achievability of cut-set bound for a class of erasure relay channels: The non-degraded case," in *ISITA*, 2004.

[7] G. Kramer, M. Gastpar, and P. Gupta, "Cooperative strategies and capacity theorems for relay networks," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 51, no. 9, pp. 3037–3063, Sept 2005.

[8] J. N. Laneman, D. N. Tse, and G. W. Wornell, "Cooperative diversity in wireless networks: Efficient protocols and outage behavior," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 3062–3080, 2004.

[9] E. M. Yeh and R. A. Berry, "Throughput optimal control of cooperative

relay networks," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 53, no. 10, pp. 3827–3833, 2007.

[10] R. Urgaonkar and M. J. Neely, "Delay-limited cooperative communication with reliability constraints in wireless networks," *Transactions on Information Theory*, 2014.

[11] S. Supittayapornpong and M. J. Neely, "Achieving utility-delay-reliability tradeoff in stochastic network optimization with finite buffers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.03457*, 2015.

[12] E. Altman, K. Avratchenkov, N. Bonneau, M. Debbah, R. El-Azouzi, and D. S. Menasché, "Constrained stochastic games in wireless networks," in *Global Telecommunications Conference, 2007. GLOBECOM'07. IEEE*. IEEE, 2007, pp. 315–320.

[13] R. Berry and R. Gallager, "Communication over fading channels with delay constraints," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2002.

[14] B. E. Collins and R. L. Cruz, "Transmission policies for time varying channels with average delay constraints," in *Allerton*, 1999.

[15] M. L. Puterman, *Markov Decision Processes: Discrete Stochastic Dynamic Programming*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1994.

[16] D. S. Menasché, D. Goeckel, and D. Towsley, "Optimal forwarding strategies for the relay channel under average delay constraints," in *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM workshop on Wireless of the students, by the students, for the students*. ACM, 2010, pp. 1–4.

[17] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of modern mathematical physics: Functional analysis*. Gulf Professional Publishing, 1980, vol. 1.

[18] E. d. S. e Silva and R. M. Leao, "The tangram-ii environment," in *Computer Performance Evaluation. Modelling Techniques and Tools*. Springer, 2000, pp. 366–369.

[19] E. de Souza e Silva, H. R. Gail, and R. R. Muntz, *Efficient solutions for a class of non-Markovian models*. Springer, 1995.

[20] P. Ballarini, N. Bertrand, A. Horváth, M. Paolieri, and E. Vicario, "Transient analysis of networks of stochastic timed automata using stochastic state classes," in *Quantitative Evaluation of Systems*. Springer, 2013, pp. 355–371.

APPENDIX A
PROOF OF LEMMA 1

Proof:

To show that operators $\mathbb{A}_d, \mathbb{A}_r, \mathbb{T}$ preserve properties 1)-5) consider some $\{U, U^{(d,a)}, U^{(r,a)}, U^{(d,d)}, U^{(r,d)}\} \in \mathcal{S}$, hence possess all properties $1)-5)$. We show that applying the corresponding operators results in functions which possess these properties as well. Note that the preservation should be separately proved for the general state and for the boundary conditions.

Denote $c_d = (1-p_d)C(\mu_d)\beta_d$ and $c_r = (1-p_r)C(\mu_r)$. Observe from (5) and (4) that following relation holds

$$V_n^{(d,d)} = V_{n-1}^{(d,a)} + c_d \tag{7}$$

$$V_n^{(r,d)} = V_{n-1}^{(r,a)} + c_r \tag{8}$$

Denote $D_n = \mu_d\delta_d U_n + \lambda\delta_d {U^{(d,a)}}_{n+1}$ and $R_n = \mu_r\delta_r U_n + \lambda\delta_r {U^{(r,a)}}_{n+1}$.

Property 4: In order to prove that

$$U_n^{(d,d)} - U_n^{(r_d)} \text{ is increasing in n} \tag{9}$$

Write (9) as follows,

$$\mu_d\delta_d U_{n-1} - \mu_r\delta_r U_{n-1} + \lambda\delta_d {U^{(d,a)}}_n - \lambda\delta_r {U^{(r,a)}}_n + c_d - c_r \tag{10}$$

Note that (9) is equivalent to $D_n - R_n$. Apply the operators to (10),

$$\Theta_n = \mu_d\delta_d\mathbb{T}U_{n-1} - \mu_r\delta_r\mathbb{T}U_{n-1} + \lambda\delta_d\mathbb{A}_d {U^{(d,a)}}_n - \lambda\delta_r\mathbb{A}_r {U^{(r,a)}}_n + c_d - c_r$$

Divide the proof into two possible cases cases, depending on whether $\mathbb{T}U_{n-1} = \mathbb{T}_d U_{n-1}$ or $\mathbb{T}U_{n-1} = \mathbb{T}_r U_{n-1}$

1) $\underline{\mathbb{T}U_{n-1} = \mathbb{T}_d U_{n-1}}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_n &= \mu_d\delta_d\left(\mu_d\delta_d U_{n-2} + \lambda\delta_d {U^{(d,a)}}_{n-1} + c_d\right)\\ &- \mu_r\delta_r\left(\mu_d\delta_d U_{n-2} + \lambda\delta_d {U^{(d,a)}}_{n-1} + c_d\right)\\ &+ \lambda\delta_d\left(\mu_d\delta_d U_n + \lambda\delta_d {U^{(d,a)}}_{n+1}\right)\\ &- \lambda\delta_r\left(\mu_r\delta_r U_n + \lambda\delta_r {U^{(r,a)}}_{n+1}\right) + c_d - c_r\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Write

$$\begin{aligned}&\Theta_n = \mu_d\delta_d(D_{n-2} + c_d) - \mu_r\delta_r(D_{n-2} + c_d)\\ &\lambda\delta_d(D_n) - \lambda\delta_r(R_n) + c_d - c_r\\ &= \mu_d\delta_d(D_{n-2} + c_d) - \mu_r\delta_r(D_{n-2} + c_d)\\ &+ \lambda\delta_d(D_n) - \lambda\delta_r(R_n) + c_d - c_r\\ &- \lambda\delta_r(D_n) + \lambda\delta_r(D_n)\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

See that D_n and R_n are concave due to the concavity of $U_n, U_n^{d,a}$ and $U_n^{r,a}$. Now observe that

$$\mu_d\delta_d - \mu_r\delta_r + \lambda\delta_d - \lambda\delta_r = \gamma\delta_d\delta_r(\mu_d - \mu_r) > 0$$

Use the bound for the slope twice, that is $U_n < U_{n-1} + K$ and $U_n < U_{n+1} + K$ and apply it to D_n. Observe that $\lambda\delta_d - \lambda\delta_r < 0$, and denote $D_n = D_{n-2} + \phi_1(n)$. Hence, $(\lambda\delta_d - \lambda\delta_r)D_n = (D_{n-2} + \phi_1(n))(\lambda\delta_d - \lambda\delta_r)$. Denote $\phi_2(n) = \phi_1(n)(\lambda\delta_r - \lambda\delta_d)$ and write

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_n &= (\mu_d\delta_d - \mu_r\delta_r + \lambda\delta_d - \lambda\delta_r)D_{n-2}\\ &+ \lambda\delta_r(D_n - R_n) - \phi_2(n) + \kappa,\end{aligned}$$

where $\phi(n)$ is positive decreasing by concavity of $D(n)$ and κ is a suitable constant. Since the expression above is a linear combination of increasing functions with positive coefficients and constants it is increasing. Hence, the operators do preserve property 4 in this case.

2) $\underline{\mathbb{T}U_{n-1} = \mathbb{T}_r U_{n-1}}$. The proof is analogous to that of the first case. Similarly to (12) write

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_n =&\mu_d\delta_d(R_{n-2} + c_r) - \mu_r\delta_r(R_{n-2} + c_r) + \lambda\delta_d(D_n)\\ &- \lambda\delta_r(R_n) + c_d - c_r - \lambda\delta_d(R_n) + \lambda\delta_d(R_n)\end{aligned}$$

Again, use the property of the bounded slope and write

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_n &= (\mu_d\delta_d - \mu_r\delta_r + \lambda\delta_d - \lambda\delta_r)R_{n-2}\\ &+ \lambda\delta_d(D_n - R_n) - \phi_3(n) + \kappa_1,\end{aligned}$$

where $\phi_3(n)$ is positive decreasing by concavity of $D(n)$ and for some suitable κ_1. Since the expression above is a linear combination of increasing functions with positive coefficients and constants it is increasing. Hence, the operators preserve property 4 in this case as well.

3) *Boundary conditions*

Note that at $n = 0$ there is no decision to be made, while the proof for $n = 1$ is identical to that of $1 < n < B$. At state B observe that

$$\mathbb{A}_d U_B^{d,a} = \mathbb{A}U_{B-1}^{d,a} \text{ and } \mathbb{A}_r U_B^{r,a} = \mathbb{A}U_{B-1}^{r,a} \tag{13}$$

. Write

$$\begin{aligned}&\mu_d\delta_d\mathbb{T}U_{B-1} - \mu_r\delta_r\mathbb{T}U_{B-1} +\\ &\lambda\delta_d\mathbb{A}_d {U^{(d,a)}}_B - \lambda\delta_r\mathbb{A}_r {U^{(r,a)}}_B + c_d - c_r -\\ &\left(\mu_d\delta_d\mathbb{T}U_{B-2} - \mu_r\delta_r\mathbb{T}U_{B-2} +\right.\\ &\left.\lambda\delta_d\mathbb{A}_d {U^{(d,a)}}_{B-1} - \lambda\delta_r\mathbb{A}_r {U^{(r,a)}}_{B-1} + c_d - c_r\right) =\\ &\mu_d\delta_d\mathbb{T}U_{B-1} - \mu_r\delta_r\mathbb{T}U_{B-1} -\\ &\left(\mu_d\delta_d\mathbb{T}U_{B-2} - \mu_r\delta_r\mathbb{T}U_{B-2}\right) \geq 0\end{aligned}$$

The inequality above is true by the increasing property of U_n.

Slope bound:

1) $\underline{\mathbb{T}U_n - \mathbb{T}U_{n-1} \leq K,}$

Note that $\lambda\delta_d + \mu_d\delta_d < 1$. We divide the proof into four cases.

Case 1: $\mathbb{T}U_n = \mathbb{T}_d U_n$ and $\mathbb{T}U_{n-1} = \mathbb{T}_d U_{n-1}$. In this case,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{T}U_n - \mathbb{T}U_{n-1} \leq \\ &\leq \mu_d\delta_d U_{n-1} + \lambda\delta_d U_n^{(d,a)} + c_d - \mu_d\delta_d U_{n-2} - \lambda\delta_d U_{n-1}^{(d,a)} - c_d \\ &\leq \mu_d\delta_d K + \lambda\delta_d K, \\ &\leq K\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the property holds.

Case 2: $\mathbb{T}U_n = \mathbb{T}_r U_n$ and $\mathbb{T}U_{n-1} = \mathbb{T}_r U_{n-1}$. The proof is identical to case 1, and is omitted.

Case 3: $\mathbb{T}U_n = \mathbb{T}_d U_n$ and $\mathbb{T}U_{n-1} = \mathbb{T}_r U_{n-1}$. Write

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{T}U_n - \mathbb{T}U_{n-1} \leq \\ &\mu_d\delta_d U_{n-1} + \lambda\delta_d U_n^{(d,a)} + c_d - \mu_r\delta_r U_{n-2} - \lambda\delta_r U_{n-1}^{(r,a)} - c_r \leq \\ &\mu_d\delta_d U_{n-1} + \lambda\delta_d U_n^{(d,a)} + c_d - \mu_d\delta_d U_{n-2} - \lambda\delta_d U_{n-1}^{(d,a)} - c_d \leq \\ &\mu_d\delta_d K + \lambda\delta_d K \\ &\leq K\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the property holds.

Case 4: $\mathbb{T}U_n = \mathbb{T}_r U_n$ and $\mathbb{T}U_{n-1} = \mathbb{T}_d U_{n-1}$. This case contradicts property 4 and thus is excluded.

2) $\mathbb{A}_d U_n^{(d,a)} - \mathbb{A}_d U_{n-1}^{(d,a)} \leq K$ To show the bound for $U^{(d,a)}$ write

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{A}_d U_n^{(d,a)} - \mathbb{A}_d U_{n-1}^{(d,a)} = \\ &= \delta_d\mu_d U_n + \delta_d\lambda U_{n+1}^{(d,a)} - \delta_d\mu_d U_{n-1} - \delta_d\lambda U_n^{(d,a)} \\ &\leq \delta_d(\mu_d + \lambda)K \\ &\leq K\end{aligned}$$

3) $\mathbb{A}_r U_n^{(r,a)} - \mathbb{A}_r U_{n-1}^{(r,a)} \leq K$. The proof is identical to the previous one.

4) *Boundary conditions*
Write boundary conditions for the state B. As $\mathbb{A}_d U_{d,B} - \mathbb{A}_d U_{d,B-1} = 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{A}_d U_B^{d,a} - \mathbb{A}_d U_{B-1}^{d,d} < K$$

The proof for $\mathbb{A}_r$ is similar. The prove for $\mathbb{T}$ at B is similar to that at $n < B$. To see that write:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{T}_d U_B - \mathbb{T}_d U_{B-1} = \delta_d\mu_d U_{B-1} + \delta_d\lambda U_B^{d,a} - \\ &\delta_d\mu_d U_{B-2} - \delta_d\lambda U_{B-1}^{d,a}\end{aligned}$$

5) *Constant K*
It is left to select the constant K. We do this by proving the bound for the boundary conditions at 0.
We show that

$$U_1 - U_0 \leq K \Rightarrow \mathbb{T}U_1 - \mathbb{T}U_0 \leq K \tag{14}$$

a) *Case 1:* Assume $\mathbb{T}U_1 = \mathbb{T}_d U_1$ and $\mathbb{T}U_0 = \mathbb{T}_d U_0$. From (6) we have

$$V_0^{d,d} = \mathbb{T}_d U_0 = \lambda\bar{\delta} V_0^{(d,a)}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{T}U_1 - \mathbb{T}U_0 = \\ &\mathbb{T}_d U_1 - \mathbb{T}_d U_0 = \\ &\mu_d\delta_d U_0 + \lambda\delta_d U_1^{d,a} + c_d - \lambda\bar{\delta} U_0^{d,a} = \qquad (15) \\ &\mu_d\delta_d U_0 - \mu_d\lambda\delta_d\bar{\delta} U_0^{d,a} + c_d + \lambda\delta_d(U_1^{d,a} - U_0^{d,a}) \qquad (16) \\ &\leq \mu_d\delta_d U_0 - \mu_d\lambda\delta_d\bar{\delta} U_0^{d,a} + c_d + \lambda\delta_d K\end{aligned}$$

(16) is obtained from (15) using the following

$$\begin{aligned}&\bar{\delta} - \delta_d = 1/(\gamma+\lambda) - 1/(\gamma+\lambda+\mu_d) \\ &= (\gamma+\lambda+\mu_d-\gamma-\lambda)/((\gamma+\lambda)(\gamma+\lambda+\mu_d)) \\ &= \mu_d/((\gamma+\lambda)(\gamma+\lambda+\mu_d)) \\ &= \mu_d\delta_d\bar{\delta}\end{aligned}$$

Denote $K_1 = \mu_d\delta_d U_0 - \mu_d\lambda\delta_d\bar{\delta} U_{d,0} + c_d$.

b) *Case 2:.* Assume $\mathbb{T}U_1 = \mathbb{T}_r U_1$ and $\mathbb{T}U_0 = \mathbb{T}_r U_0$.

$$V_0^{r,d} = \mathbb{T}_r U_0 = \lambda\bar{\delta} V_0^{(r,a)}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{T}U_1 - \mathbb{T}U_0 = \\ &\mathbb{T}_r U_{r,1} - \mathbb{T}_r U_{r,0} \\ &\leq \mu_r\delta_r U_0 - \mu_r\lambda\delta_r\bar{\delta} U_{r,0} + c_r + \lambda\delta_r K\end{aligned}$$

Denote $K_2 = \mu_r\delta_r U_0 - \mu_r\lambda\delta_r\bar{\delta} U_{r,0} + c_r$.

c) *Case 3:* Assume $\mathbb{T}U_1 = \mathbb{T}_d U_1$ and $\mathbb{T}U_0 = \mathbb{T}_r U_0$. This case is identical to case 1, because $\mathbb{T}_r U_0 = \mathbb{T}_d U_0$.

K has to satisfy $K_1 + \lambda\delta_d K \leq K$ and $K_2 + \lambda\delta_r K \leq K$, that is, $K_1 \leq (\mu_d+\gamma)\delta_d K$ and $K_2 \leq (\mu_r+\gamma)\delta_r K$. Setting $K = \max\left\{\frac{K_1}{(\mu_d+\gamma)\delta_d}, \frac{K_2}{(\mu_r+\gamma)\delta_r}\right\}$ suffices to bound the slope in all cases.

Concavity: We now show that $U_n, U_n^{(d,a)}, U_n^{(r,a)}$, where $n \in \{1, \cdots, B\}$ are concave.

1) Concavity of $\mathbb{A}_d U_n^{(d,a)}$ Apply the operator

$$\mathbb{A}_d U_n^{d,a} - \mathbb{A}_d U_{n-1}^{d,a} \geq \mathbb{A}_d U_{n-1}^{d,a} - \mathbb{A}_d U_{n-2}^{d,a}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}&\mu_d\delta_d U_{n+1} + \lambda\delta_d U_{d,n+2} + \mu_d\delta_d U_{n-1} + \lambda\delta_d U_n^{(d,a)} \leq \\ &2(\mu_d\delta_d U_n + \lambda\delta_d U_{n+1}^{(d,a)}),\end{aligned}$$

which trivially holds because of the concavity of $U^{(d,a)}$ and U. For the boundary at B the inequality similarly holds by concavity and increasing property of $U^{(d,a)}$ and U.

2) Concavity of $\mathbb{A}_r U_n^{(r,a)}$ The proof for $\mathbb{A}_r$ is identical.

3) Concavity of $\mathbb{T}U_n$
Case 1: $\mathbb{T}U_n = \mathbb{T}_d U_n$ and $\mathbb{T}U_{n-1} = \mathbb{T}_d U_{n-1}$ Write

$$\begin{aligned}&\mu_d\delta_d U_n + \lambda\delta_d U_{n+1}^{(d,a)} + c_d + \mu_d\delta_d U_{n-2} + \lambda\delta_d U_{n-1}^{(d,a)} + c_d \leq \\ &2(\mu_d\delta_d U_{n-1} + \lambda\delta_d U_n^{(d,a)} + c_d)\end{aligned}$$

which trivially holds because of the concavity of $U^{(d,a)}$ and U.

Case 2: $\mathbb{T}U_n = \mathbb{T}_d U_n$ and $\mathbb{T}U_{n-1} = \mathbb{T}_r U_{n-1}$. In this case, we should substitute $TU_n = \mathbb{T}_d U_n = U_n^{(d,d)}$ and $TU_{n-1} = \mathbb{T}_r U_{n-1} = U_{n-1}^{(r,d)}$. Observe that we have to prove the following

$$\mathbb{T}_d U_{n+1} + \mathbb{T}_r U_{n-1} \leq 2\mathbb{T}_d U_n$$

we show the stronger inequality

$$\mathbb{T}_d U_{n+1} + \mathbb{T}_r U_{n-1} \leq \mathbb{T}_d U_n + \mathbb{T}_r U_n, \quad (17)$$

Hence, we have to show that

$$\mathbb{T}_d U_{n+1} - \mathbb{T}_d U_n \leq \mathbb{T}_r U_n - \mathbb{T}_r U_{n-1} \quad (18)$$

By assumption of this case, we substitute $TU_n = \mathbb{T}_d U_n = U_n^{(d,d)}$,$TU_{n+1} = \mathbb{T}_d U_{n+1} = U_{n+1}^{(d,d)}$ and $TU_{n-1} = \mathbb{T}_r U_{n-1} = U_{n-1}^{(r,d)}$.

$$U_{n+1}^{(d,d)} - U_n^{(d,d)} \leq U_n^{(r,d)} - U_{n-1}^{(r,d)}, \quad (19)$$

Substitute (7) and (8)

$$U_n^{(d,a)} + c_d - U_{n-1}^{(d,a)} - c_d \leq U_{n-1}^{(r,a)} + c_r - U_{r,n-2} - c_r,$$

which is true by inter-concavity and the basis assumption that $U \in \mathcal{S}$.

Case 3: $\mathbb{T}U_n = \mathbb{T}_r U_n$ and $\mathbb{T}U_{n-1} = \mathbb{T}_r U_{n-1}$

Write

$$\mathbb{T}_d U_{n+1} + \mathbb{T}_r U_{n-1} \leq 2\mathbb{T}_r U_n$$

Since $\mathbb{T}_d U_n < \mathbb{T}_r U_n$ the stronger inequality which is identical to (17) can be proven as well. Hence, the property in this case follows.

4) *Boundary conditions.* For $\mathbb{A}_d$, at state 0, write

$$U_2^{d,a} - U_1^{d,a} \leq U_1^{d,a} - U_0^{d,a},$$

Since the operator acts at 0 similarly as at $n > 0$ the statement holds. At B write

$$U_B^{d,a} - U_{B-1}^{d,a} \leq U_{B-1}^{d,a} - U_{B-2}^{d,a},$$

Recall that $\mathbb{A}_d U_{d,B} = \mathbb{A}_d U_{d,B-1}$. Hence, by increasing property of $U_n^{(d,a)}$ the statement at B holds as well. The proof for $\mathbb{A}_r$ is identical. For $\mathbb{T}$, note that at 0 there is no decision. At B, the operator works similarly to as $n < B$, so no special treatment is needed. This finalizes the boundary conditions for the concavity.

***Inter-concavity**:*

1) *$U^{(r,a)}$ is inter-concave with respect to $U^{(d,a)}$* We show that if $U^{(r,a)}$ is inter-concave with respect to $U^{(d,a)}$ then $\mathbb{A}_r U^{(r,a)}$ is inter-concave with respect to $\mathbb{A}_d U^{(d,a)}$. Assume that

$$U_{n+1}^{(d,a)} - U_n^{(d,a)} \leq U_n^{(r,a)} - U_{n-1}^{(r,a)} \quad (20)$$

Apply $\mathbb{A}_d$ and $\mathbb{A}_r$

$$\mathbb{A}_d U_{n+1}^{(d,a)} - \mathbb{A}_d U_n^{(d,a)} \leq \mathbb{A}_r U_n^{(r,a)} - \mathbb{A}_r U_{n-1}^{(r,a)} \quad (21)$$

write

$$\mu_d \delta_d U_{n+1} + \lambda \delta_d U_{d,n+2} - \mu_d \delta_d U_n - \lambda \delta_d U_{n+1}^{(d,a)} \leq$$
$$\mu_r \delta_r U_n + \lambda \delta_r U_{n+1}^{(r,a)} - \mu_r \delta_r U_{n-1} - \lambda \delta_r U_n^{(r,a)}$$

By (7) and (8)

$$U_{n+2}^{(d,d)} - c_d - U_{n+1}^{(d,d)} + c_d \leq U_{n+1}^{(r,d)} - c_r - U_n^{(r,a)} + c_r$$

The display above holds by inter-concavity of $U^{(r,d)}$ with respect to $U^{(d,d)}$ hence, the propert holds.

2) *$U^{(r,d)}$ is inter-concave with respect to $U^{(d,d)}$.* The proof is similar in the sense that it is performed by usage of (7) and (8). We omit the technical details.

3) *Boundary conditions* We consider the case $n = 1$. To see that $U_{d,2} - U_{d,1} \leq U_{r,1} - U_{r,0}$ note again that the operators $\mathbb{A}_d, \mathbb{A}_r$ equivalently act for $U_{r,0}$ hence, there is no difference between the proof in this case and in case $B > n > 0$.

Next, we consider the case $n = B - 1$. To see that $U_{d,B} - U_{d,B-1} \leq U_{r,B-1} - U_{r,B-2}$ recall that $\mathbb{A}_d U_{d,B} - \mathbb{A}_d U_{d,B-1} = 0$, hence the statement holds at this boundary condition as well.

To prove the boundary conditions for $U^{(d,d)}$ and $U^{(r,d)}$ see that for $n = 0$ there is no decision hence both concavity and inter-concavity are not necessary. For $\mathbb{T}_d U_B^{(d,d)} - \mathbb{T}_d U_{B-1}^{(d,d)} \leq \mathbb{T}_r U_{B-1}^{(r,d)} - \mathbb{T}_r U_{B-2}^{(r,d)}$

Increasing property

Finally, we show that $\mathbb{T}U_n, \mathbb{A}_d U_n^{(d,a)}, \mathbb{A}_r U_n^{(r,a)}$, $n \in \{1, \cdots, B\}$ are non-decreasing.

For $\mathbb{T}U_n$, we assume that $U_n \geq U_{n-1}$ and we show that $\mathbb{T}U_n \geq \mathbb{T}U_{n-1}$. Indeed,

$$\mu_d \delta_d U_{n-1} + \lambda \delta_d U_n^{(d,a)} + c_d \geq \mu_d \delta_d U_{n-2} + \lambda \delta_d U_{n-1}^{(d,a)} + c_d$$

For $\mathbb{A}_d U_n^{(d,a)}$ we have,

$$\mu_d \delta_d U_n + \lambda \delta_d U_{n+1}^{(d,a)} \geq \mu_d \delta_d U_n + \lambda \delta_d U_{n+1}^{(d,a)},$$

with equality at B. Similarly, it can be shown that the result holds for $\mathbb{A}_r$.

■

APPENDIX B
BELLMAN EQUATION FOR THE EXPONENTIAL CASE

Denote by $u_n = 0$ the decision to send through the direct channel and $u_n = 1$ through the non-direct one (i.e towards the relay). We assume the stationary policy. Note that the reward (c_r or c_d) is immediately received at $V_n(t)$. Take infinitesimal θ, such that probability that more than one event occur in $[0, \theta]$ goes to zero.

Use dynamic programming principle to write

$$V_n(t) = \int_t^{t+\theta} e^{-\gamma s} r(s) dR(s) + e^{-\gamma(\theta+t)} V_n(t+\theta), \quad (22)$$

where $r(s)$ denotes reward at time instant s, $R(s)$ is Poisson counting process which mean will be specified below. Due to the stationary property we will assume the initial time

$t = 0$, and will omit the time mark where it is clear. To assume the immediate reward we take θ infinitesimal. Denote $\int_0^\theta e^{-\gamma s} r(s) dR(s) = r_\theta$

$$\begin{aligned} V_n = r_\theta + \\ + e^{-\gamma\theta}\Big[\theta\lambda(1-u_n)V_n^{d,a} + \theta\lambda u_n V_n^{r,a} \\ \theta\mu_r u_n V_{n-1} + \theta\mu_d(1-u_n)V_{n-1} + \\ V_n(1-\theta\lambda(1-u_n) - \theta\lambda u_n - \theta\mu_r u_n - \theta\mu_d(1-u_n))\Big] \end{aligned}$$

where the first term stands for the product of reward the average transmission rate, the routing decision and the channel state at transmission time. The term in brackets sums up all possible outcomes for the value function at time θ weighted by the corresponding probabilities. (e.g. arrivals happen w.p. $\lambda\theta$). Now, since θ is small, substitute $e^{-\gamma\theta} \approx 1 - \gamma\theta$,

$$\begin{aligned} V_n = r_\theta + (1-\gamma\theta)[\theta\lambda(1-u_n)V_n^{d,a} + \theta\lambda u_n V_n^{r,a} + \\ \theta\mu_r u_n V_{n-1} + \theta\mu_d(1-u_n)V_{n-1} + \\ V_n(1-\theta(1-u_n+u_n)\lambda - \theta\mu_r u_n - \theta\mu_d(1-u_n))] \end{aligned}$$

See that $\theta^2 \to 0$

$$\begin{aligned} V_n = r_\theta + [\theta\lambda V_{n+1} + \\ \theta\mu_r u_n V_{n-1} + \theta\mu_d(1-u_n)V_{n-1} + \\ V_n(1-\theta\lambda - \theta\mu_r u_n - \theta\mu_d(1-u_n)) - \gamma\theta V_n] \end{aligned}$$

Denote $\delta^{-1} = \lambda + \mu_d u + \mu_r(1-u_n) + \gamma$. See that V_n cancel on both sides.

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = r_\theta + [\lambda(1-u_n)V_n^{d,a} + \lambda(u_n)V_n^{r,a} + \\ \mu_r u_n V_{n-1} + \mu_d(1-u_n)V_{n-1} - \delta^{-1}V_n]\theta \end{aligned}$$

Calculate now r_θ. The reward is received in any case, whenever the process does not change, arrival happens or transmission ends. Hence at V_n we have reward approximately accumulated with Poisson process with mean rate $\lambda + \mu_r u_n + \mu_d(1-u_n) + \gamma$, where the terms stand for summation of the rates of arrival, relay transmission, direct transmission and the discounting rate. Hence, $dR = dt(\lambda + \mu_r u_n + \mu_d(1-u_n) + \gamma)$. Substitute

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\theta e^{-\gamma t} r(s) dR(s) = \\ = (\lambda + \mu_r u_n + \mu_d(1-u_n) + \gamma)C \int_0^\theta e^{-\gamma t} dt \\ = (\lambda + \mu_r u_n + \mu_d(1-u_n) + \gamma)C \frac{1 - e^{\gamma\theta}}{\gamma} \\ = \theta(\lambda + \mu_r u_n + \mu_d(1-u_n) + \gamma)C \end{aligned}$$

where $r(s) = C$ for $s \in (0, \theta)$, and $C = (1-u_n)c_d + u_n c_r$. Note that $c_d = (1-p_d)\frac{\mu_d}{\gamma+\mu_d}$,

$$c_d = (1-p_d)\int_0^\infty e^{-\mu_d t} e^{-\gamma t} dt \quad (23)$$

$$= (1-p_d)\frac{\mu_d}{\gamma+\mu_d} \quad (24)$$

c_d stands for average reward equal to $1 - p_d$, discounted according to the transmission direct time. c_r is equivalently known.

Substitute the reward

$$V_n\theta\delta^{-1} = \theta(\lambda + \mu_r u_n + \mu_d(1-u_n) + \gamma)C + \quad (25)$$

$$[\lambda(1-u_n)V_n^{d,a} + \lambda(u_n)V_n^{r,a} + \\ \mu_r u_n V_{n-1} + \mu_d(1-u_n)V_{n-1}]\theta + o^2(\theta) \quad (26)$$

Since the routing decision is applied on u_n, the Bellman equation follows by the maximization over $u_n = \{0, 1\}$. Substitute the $\max$ operator, divide by $\theta\delta^{-1}$, and let $\theta \to 0$,

$$V_n = \max[c_r + \mu_r\delta_r V_{n-1} + \lambda\delta_r V_n^{r,a}, c_d + \mu_d\delta_d V_{n-1} + \lambda\delta_d V_n^{d,a}]$$

APPENDIX C
THROUGHPUT ASSESSMENT

In this section we assume that a threshold policy is given. Our aim is to assess the throughput. Recall that given threshold T, the policy consists of transmitting through the relay if the number of packets in the buffer is smaller than or equal to T at the time at which the transmission starts, and transmitting directly otherwise. Note that we assume that a packet is removed from the buffer immediately after its transmission ends. Decisions are made immediately after 1) a packet arrives to an empty system, or 2) a packet is removed from the buffer which remains occupied.

Note that as the policy is fixed, our object of study is a semi-Markov process (SMP). Semi-Markov decision processes (SMDPs) are based on SMPs. In what follows, we show how to compute the expected impulse reward of the semi-Markov process (SMP) of interest. The resulting metric is the throughput.

Assume that we are given matrix $\mathbf{D}$ (resp., $\mathbf{R}$), whose (i, j) entry indicates the probability that the system contains j packets after a direct (resp., relay) transmission, given that it contained i packets before the transmission. $\mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{R}$ are the transition matrices of the embedded chain. Let d_{ij} (r_{ij}) be the entry (i, j) of matrix $\mathbf{D}$ (resp., $\mathbf{R}$).

To evaluate the throughput of a threshold policy, with threshold T, we proceed as follows:

1) we consider a state space Ω comprising states of the form $\sigma = (i, j)$ where i is the number of packets in the buffer, and j is given as follows,

$$j = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{no packet being transmitted} \\ R & \text{packet being transmitted through relay} \\ D & \text{packet being transmitted through direct channel} \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

Note that the state space comprises states of the form (i, j) such that,

$$(i, j) = \begin{cases} (0, 0) & \text{empty system} \\ (i, R) & 0 < i \le T \\ (i, D) & T < i \le Q - 1 \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

2) let $|\Omega|$ be the state space cardinality, $|\Omega| = 1 + (Q-1) = Q$, where Q is the buffer size. Note that if the buffer size

is Q, we can have at most $Q-1$ packets in the system at any decision epoch. This is because decision epochs occur immediately after departures. Before a departure, the system might have up to Q packets, including the one being transmitted. Immediately after a departure, the system might have up to $Q-1$ packets.

3) we build the $|\Omega|\times|\Omega|$ transition matrix $\mathbf{P}$, corresponding to the given threshold policy.
   a) if $i=0$ and $T=0$, $p_{(i,0),(1,D)}=1$,
   b) if $i=0$ and $T\neq 0$, $p_{(i,0),(1,R)}=1$,
   c) if $i>0$ and $0<j\leq T$, $p_{(i,D),(j,R)}=d_{ij}$ and $p_{(i,R),(j,R)}=r_{ij}$
   d) if $i>0$ and $j>T$, $p_{(i,D),(j,D)}=d_{ij}$ and $p_{(i,R),(j,D)}=r_{ij}$
   e) if $i>0$ and $j=0$, $p_{(i,D),(j,0)}=d_{ij}$ and $p_{(i,R),(j,0)}=r_{ij}$
4) we solve $\boldsymbol{\pi}=\boldsymbol{\pi}\mathbf{P}$ to obtain $\boldsymbol{\pi}$, the fraction of visits to each state. The system solution might be obtained using Gaussian elimination (which involves a matrix inversion), or one of its variants, such as GTH. Alternatively, the power method can also be employed.
5) we compute the fraction of time at which the system remains at each state, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$. Let τ_σ be the mean time, per visit, at state $\sigma=(i,j)$,

$$\tau_{(i,j)}=\begin{cases}1/\lambda, & i=0\\ 1/\mu_r, & j=R\\ 1/\mu_d, & j=D\end{cases} \tag{29}$$

Then,

$$\kappa = \sum_{\forall\sigma\in\Omega}\pi_\sigma\tau_\sigma \tag{30}$$

$$\tilde{\pi}_\sigma = \pi_\sigma\tau_\sigma/\kappa \tag{31}$$

Note that the probability $\sum_{\forall i}\tilde{\pi}_{(i,D)}$ (resp., $\sum_{\forall i}\tilde{\pi}_{(i,R)}$) corresponds to the probability that the system is busy transferring a packet through the direct channel (resp., relay). This follows from the fact that matrix $\mathbf{P}$ characterizes the system dynamics, and its solution yields the system steady state probabilities.

6) let ρ_σ be the instantaneous impulse reward (throughput) obtained after a transition from state $\sigma=(i,j)$ to any state σ',

$$\rho_{(i,j)}=\begin{cases}0, & j=0\\ 1-p_r, & j=R\\ 1-p_d, & j=D\end{cases} \tag{32}$$

7) the throughput is given by

$$throughput=\sum_{\forall\sigma\in\Omega}\tilde{\pi}_\sigma\rho_\sigma/\tau_\sigma \tag{33}$$

Consider a long interval of time with duration I. The system remains roughly $\tilde{\pi}_\sigma I$ time units at state σ, and visits state σ roughly $\tilde{\pi}_\sigma I/\tau_\sigma$ times. For every visit to state σ, ρ_σ is the obtained impulse reward. Therefore, the expected impulse reward obtained from visits to state σ is $\tilde{\pi}_\sigma\rho_\sigma I/\tau_\sigma$. Normalizing by the duration I, we obtain the expected impulse reward per time unit derived from state σ, which is $\tilde{\pi}_\sigma\rho_\sigma/\tau_\sigma$. Summing for all states, we obtain the system throughput.

Equivalently,

$$throughput=\left(\sum_{\forall i}\tilde{\pi}_{(i,D)}\right)\mu_d(1-p_d)+\left(\sum_{\forall i}\tilde{\pi}_{(i,R)}\right)\mu_r(1-p_r) \tag{34}$$

Special cases:

- **Exponential service times**: in case the service times are exponentially distributed, policy evaluation consists of computing the expected instantaneous reward of a continuous-time Markov chain. In this case, tools like Tangram-II [18] can be used to compute the metrics of interest. The system can be solved either using the embedded process (as described in this section – see Figure 4), or directly using the natural process (see Figure 5).
- **Deterministic service times**: special solution methods can be used to efficiently compute the throughput if service times are deterministic. In particular, Tangram-II implements the methods proposed in [19] for this purpose. Alternatively, the equations for the embedded Markov chain follow from the discussion in Section III-2 and can be used to assess the throughput using the ideas presented in this appendix.
- **Uniform service times**: the equations for the embedded Markov chain have been presented in Section III-3. Together with the algorithm introduced in this appendix, the throughput can be assessed.
- **Other service time distributions**: to compute the throughput under other service time distributions, the Oris tool [20] is very handful. Table III illustrates the input to Oris. We consider three state variables, W, D, R, characterizing the number of waiting packets, and the number of packets being transmitted through the direct and relay channels, respectively. Note that $W\in\{0,1,\ldots,Q-1\}$, $D\in\{0,1\}$ and $R\in\{0,1\}$.



Fig. 4. Policy evaluation using embedded process



Fig. 5. Policy evaluation using natural process

event description	time between events	condition	update
packet arrives	exponential, rate λ	$W + D + R < Q$	$W \leftarrow W + 1$
relay service starts	0 (instantaneous)	$W > 0$ and $D = 0$ and $R = 0$ and $W \leq T$	$W \leftarrow W - 1$, $R \leftarrow R + 1$
direct service starts	0 (instantaneous)	$W > 0$ and $D = 0$ and $R = 0$ and $W > T$	$W \leftarrow W - 1$, $D \leftarrow D + 1$
relay service ends	general, rate μ_r	$R = 1$	$R \leftarrow R - 1$
direct service ends	general, rate μ_d	$D = 1$	$D \leftarrow D - 1$

TABLE III
THRESHOLD POLICY CHARACTERIZATION



Fig. 6. Throughput for a buffer of size 10



Fig. 7. Throughput for a buffer of size 50